arXiv:1401.7213v1 [math.NA] 28 Jan 2014

EXISTENCE AND CONVERGENCE OF GALERKIN APPROXIMATION FOR SECOND ORDER HYPERBOLIC EQUATIONS WITH MEMORY TERM

FARDIN SAEDPANAH

Abstract. We study a second order hyperbolic initial-boundary value partial differential equation with memory, that results in an integro-differential equation with a convolution kernel. The kernel is assumed to be either smooth or no worse than weakly singular, that arise ,e.g., in linear and fractional order viscoelasticity. Existence and uniqueness of the spatial local and global Galerkin approximation of the problem is proved by means of Picard iteration. Then spatial finite element approximation of the problem is formulated, and optimal order a priori estimates are proved by energy method. The required regularity of the solution, for optimal order convergence, is the same as minimum regularity of the solution for second order hyperbolic partial differential equations.

1. Introduction

We study, for any fixed $T > 0$, integro-differential equations of the form

$$\ddot{u} + Au - \int_0^t K(t-s)Au(s)\,ds = f, \quad t \in (0,T), \quad \text{with } u(0) = u^0,\ \dot{u}(0) = u^1, \tag{1.1}$$

(we use '$\cdot$' to denote '$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}$') together with a homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition on a bounded polygonal domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d = 1, 2, 3$ with boundary $\partial\Omega$, or with mixed homogeneous Dirichlet and nonhomogeneous Neumann boundary condition, that is important from practical view point. Here A is a self-adjoint, positive definite, uniformly elliptic second order linear operator on a separable Hilbert space. The kernel K is considered to be either smooth (exponential), or no worse than weakly singular, that is singular at the origin but locally integrable. We assume that the kernel has the properties

$$K \geq 0, \quad \dot{K} \leq 0, \quad \|K\|_{L_1(0,T)} = \kappa < 1. \tag{1.2}$$

Examples of this type of problems, that appear ,e.g., in the theory of linear and fractional order viscoelasticity, is found in [1], and references therein.

The Mittag-Leffler type kernels, as a chief example of fractional order kernels, is used in fractional order viscoelasticity, and interpolates between weakly singular kernels and smooth (exponential) kernels, that arise in the theory of linear viscoelasticity. This means that, the model problem (1.1) with the kernel satisfying (1.2), can capture the mechanical behavior for a wide class of materials, see [1] for

Date: January 27, 2014.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 65M60, 45K05.

Key words and phrases. integro-differential equation, Galerkin approximation, Picard iteration, finite element method, weakly singular kernel, a priori estimate.

more details and references. This is the reason for considering problem (1.1) with convolution kernel satisfying (1.2). Our cheif examples for weakly dingular kernels are

$$K(t) = \frac{t^{\alpha-1}}{\Gamma(\alpha)}, \quad 0 < \alpha < 1,$$

and the Mittag-Leffler type kernels, see [1] and [2].

There is an extensive literature on theoretical and numerical analysis for partial differential equations (PDEs) with memory, in particular integro-differential equations. To mention some, see [1], [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8], [9], and their references.

In [1] well-posedness of a problem, that is slightly more general than (1.1), has been studied based on (a global) Galerkin approximation method. The first step, [1, §3.2], is to prove existence of a unique solution of the approximate problem by Galerkin method, and using the Laplace tranform. In this work, we extend and give an alternative proof for existence and uniqueness of local and global Galerkin approximation methods, and we give a straightforward and constructive proof based on Picard iteration.

We note that, we treat the model problem (1.1) as a hyperbolic second order PDE with memory. In [10], using an explicit representation of the solution of the wave equation, it has been proved that the finite element approximation of the wave equation has optimal order of convergence, and an extra derivative of regularity of the solution is required to obtain this rate of convergence, and this regularity requirement is minimum.

Spatial finite element approximation of hyperbolic integro-differential equations similar to (1.1) have been studied in [9], [11] and [12]. For some fully discrete methods see [6] and references therein. In [9] and [11], for optimal order $L_\infty(L_2)$ a priori error estimate for the solution u, they require two extra derivative of regularity of the solution. This was relaxed in [2] and [12] to one extra derivative, using the so called velocity-displacement form of the problem, that is a system of first order ordinary differential equations (ODEs) with respect to the time variable, and require stability estimates of a slightly more general problem. Here, using a different technique adapted from [13], for second order hyperbolic PDEs, we present an alternative proof to obtain $L_\infty(L_2)$ optimal order a priori error estimate with one extra derivative regularity of the solution u, similar to [2] and [12]. Here, we do not use the so called velocity-displacement formulation, and we give a short and straightforward proof. Comparing with the second order hyperbolic PDEs, this one extra derivative seems to be minimal also for the counterpart integro-differential equations. However, a similar proof as in [10] can not be directly applied to our model problem (1.1), due to the lack of an explicit representation of the solution. This minimal regularity assumption of the solution is also an important issue, e.g. in the error analysis of the finite element approximation of PDEs, see [14]. The present work also extend previous works, e.g., [4], [8], [15], on quasi-static fractional order viscoelsticity ($\ddot{u} \approx 0$) to the dynamic case.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In §2, we bring preliminaries and introduce the weak form of the problem. Then, in §3 existence and uniqueness of local and global Galerkin approximation of the problem is proved. The spatial finite element discretization of the problem is formulated in §4, and $L_\infty(L_2)$ and

$L_\infty(H^1)$ optimal a priori error estimates for the displacement u is proved together with $L_\infty(L_2)$ optimal a priori error estimate for the velocity $\dot{u}$.

2. Preliminaries and weak formulation

We recall that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d = 1, 2, 3$, is a bounded polygonal domain with boundary $\partial\Omega$. We use the standard Sobolev spaces $H^s = H^s(\Omega)^d$ with the corresponding norms $\|\cdot\|_s$ and inner products. We denote $H = H^0 = L_2(\Omega)^d$ and $V = H_0^1(\Omega)^d$, and the corresponding norms by $\|\cdot\|$ and $\|\cdot\|_V$, respectively. We recall that A is a self-adjoint, positive definite, uniformly elliptic second order linear operator on $\mathcal{D}(A) = H^2 \cap V$. Therefore we can equip V with the inner product $a(\cdot,\cdot) = (A\cdot,\cdot)$ and the corresponding norm $\|\cdot\|_V^2 = a(\cdot,\cdot)$, since $\|\cdot\|_v$ and $\|\cdot\|_1$ are equivalent.

Then the weak form of the model problem (1.1) is read as, find $u(t) \in V$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &(\ddot{u}(t), v) + a(u(t), v) - \int_0^t K(t-s)a(u(s), v)\, ds \\ &\qquad\qquad = (f(t), v), \quad \forall v \in V,\ t \in (0, T), \\ &u(0) = u^0, \quad \dot{u}(0) = u^1. \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

In the case of mixed homogeneous Dirichlet and nonhomogeneous Neumann boundary conditions, we assume that $\partial\Omega = \partial\Omega_{\mathrm{D}} \cup \partial\Omega_{\mathrm{N}}$, where $\partial\Omega_{\mathrm{D}}$ and $\partial\Omega_{\mathrm{N}}$ are disjoint and $\mathrm{meas}(\partial\Omega_{\mathrm{D}}) \neq 0$. Then we denote $V = \{v \in H^1 : v|_{\partial\Omega_{\mathrm{D}}} = 0\}$ and $H_{\partial\Omega_{\mathrm{N}}} = L_2(\partial\Omega_{\mathrm{N}})^d$. Our chief example for this case is $Au = -\nabla\sigma_0(u)$ where σ_0 is the standard stress tensor in elasticity, see e.g., [2]. Then the corresponding nonhomogeneous Neumann boundary condition is

$$\Big(\sigma_0 - \gamma \int_0^t K(t-s)\sigma_0(s)ds\Big) \cdot n = g(t),$$

and we introduce the bilinear form (with the usual summation convention)

$$a(u, v) = \int_\Omega \big(2\mu\epsilon_{ij}(u)\epsilon_{ij}(v) + \lambda\epsilon_{ii}(u)\epsilon_{jj}(v)\big)\, dx, \quad \forall u, v \in V,$$

where ϵ is the usual strain tensor and λ, μ are elastic constants of Lamé type. It is known that $a(\cdot,\cdot)$ is coercive. Then the weak form is read as, find $u(t) \in V$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &(\ddot{u}(t), v) + a(u(t), v) - \int_0^t K(t-s)a(u(s), v)\, ds \\ &\qquad\qquad = (f(t), v) + (g(t), v)_{\partial\Omega_{\mathrm{N}}}, \quad \forall v \in V,\ t \in (0, T), \\ &u(0) = u^0, \quad \dot{u}(0) = u^1, \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

where $(g(t), v)_{\partial\Omega_{\mathrm{N}}} = \int_{\partial\Omega_{\mathrm{N}}} g(t) \cdot v\, dS$.

3. Existence and uniqueness of the Galerkin approximation solution

To be complete, we consider the model problem with mixed homogeneous Dirichlet and nonhomogeneous Neumann boundary conditions, with weak form (2.2). In this section, we study existence and uniqueness of spatial approximate solution of (1.1) by local and global Galerkin methods, using Picard iteration. In particular we use the standard finite element Galerkin method (FEGM), as a local Galerkin

method, and a global Galerkin method (GGM) based on the eigenfunctions of the operator A.

Spatial semidiscretization of (1.1) can be based on a local or global Galerkin method, using a finite dimensional subspace $V_h = \text{span}\{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_m\}$ of V. For the finite element method we use the standard finite element spaces V_h consisting of continuous piecewise polynomials, corresponding to a triangulation of the computational domain Ω. Let $\{(\lambda_j, \varphi_j)\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ be the eigenpairs of the weak eigenvalue problem

$$a(\varphi, v) = \lambda(\varphi, v), \quad \forall v \in V. \tag{3.1}$$

It is known that $\{\varphi_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ can be chosen to be an ON-basis in H and an orthogonal basis for V. Then any finite dimensional space $V_h = \text{span}\{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_m\}$ can be a basis for a GGM, so called spectral Galerkin method. Obviously limitations of the Galerkin methods, such as spectral Galerkin methods, on the computational domain Ω should be considered.

We recall the L_2-projection $P_h : H \to V_h$ and the Ritz projection $R_h : V \to V_h$ defined by

$$a(R_h v, \chi) = a(v, \chi) \quad \text{and} \quad (P_h v, \chi) = (v, \chi), \qquad \forall \chi \in V_h. \tag{3.2}$$

We also recall the truncated Fourier series projection $P_F : H \to V_h$, defined by

$$P_F v = \sum_{j=1}^{m} (v, \varphi_j)\varphi_j = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \tilde{v}\varphi_j.$$

Now, for a fixed positive integer $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we seek a function of the form

$$u_m(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \alpha_j(t)\varphi_j, \tag{3.3}$$

that satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} (\ddot{u}_m(t), \varphi_k) + a(u_m(t), \varphi_k) - \int_0^t K(t-s)a(u_m(s), \varphi_k)\, ds \\ = (f(t), \varphi_k) + (g(t), \varphi_k)_{\partial\Omega_N}, \quad k = 1, \dots, m,\ t \in (0, T), \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

with initial conditions

$$u_m(0) = P^0 u^0, \quad \dot{u}_m(0) = P^1 u^1. \tag{3.5}$$

Here P^0 and P^1 are suitable projections to be chosen, such as the standard L_2-projection, the Ritz projection, or the truncated Fourier series projection. We note that, denoting the vector $\alpha(t) = \big(\alpha_j(t)\big)_{j=1}^m$, the initial coefficients $\frac{d^l}{dt^l}\alpha(0) = \big(\frac{d^l}{dt^l}\alpha_j(0)\big)_{j=1}^m$, $l = 0, 1$, are obtained from the system of linear equations, for $l = 0, 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} &M\frac{d^l}{dt^l}\alpha(0) = \big((u^l, \varphi_i)\big)_{i=1}^m, && \text{with } L_2\text{-projection,} \\ &S\frac{d^l}{dt^l}\alpha(0) = a\big((u^l, \varphi_i)\big)_{i=1}^m, && \text{with Ritz projection,} \\ &\frac{d^l}{dt^l}\alpha(0) = \big((u^l, \varphi_i)\big)_{i=1}^m, && \text{with truncated Fourier projection,} \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

where M is the standard mass matrix and S is the stiffness matrix. Therefore the system is uniquely solvable, and, e.g., for the last case we have $\frac{d^l}{dt^l}\alpha_j(0) = (u^l, \varphi_j)$, that is,

$$\frac{d^l}{dt^l}u_m(0) = \sum_{j=1}^{m}(u^l, \varphi_j)\varphi_j, \quad l = 0, 1.$$

Now, we prove that there exists a unique solution of the form (3.3) for the spatial semidiscrete problem (3.4) with initial conditions (3.5).

Lemma 1. *Assume that the initial data u^0 and u^1 are regular such that the initial conditions in* (3.5) *are well-defined, and $g \in L_1((0,T); H_{\partial\Omega_N})$, $f \in L_1((0,T); H)$. Then, for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a unique function u_m of the form* (3.3) *satisfying* (3.4)-(3.5).

Proof. We organize our proof in three steps. First, using a Galerkin approximation method, we formulate the spatial semidiscrete form of the main problem (1.1) as a system of second kind linear Volterra equations. Then we prove existence of the solution of the semidiscrete problem by means of Picard iteration method. Finally, we prove uniqueness of the solution.

1. Substituting (3.3) in (3.4), we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m}\Big\{(\varphi_j, \varphi_k)\ddot{\alpha}_j(t) + a(\varphi_j, \varphi_k)\alpha_j(t) - a(\varphi_j, \varphi_k)\int_0^t K(t-s)\alpha_j(s)ds\Big\} = (f(t), \varphi_k) + (g(t), \varphi_k)_{\partial\Omega_N}, \quad k = 1, \ldots, m,\ t \in (0,T), \tag{3.7}$$

that is a system of linear second order ODEs with the initial data (3.5), that is computable from (3.6). Recalling the vector notation $\alpha(t) = \big(\alpha_j(t)\big)_{j=1}^m$, we rewrite (3.7) in the matrix form

$$M\ddot{\alpha}(t) + S\alpha(t) - S\int_0^t K(t-s)\alpha(s)ds = F(t) \quad t \in (0,T), \tag{3.8}$$

where

$$M = (M_{k,j})_{k,j=1}^m = \big((\varphi_j, \varphi_k)\big)_{k,j=1}^m, \quad S = (S_{k,j})_{k,j=1}^m = \big(a(\varphi_j, \varphi_k)\big)_{k,j=1}^m,$$
$$F(t) = \big(F_k(t)\big)_{k=1}^m = \big((f(t), \varphi_k) + (g(t), \varphi_k)_{\partial\Omega_N}\big)_{k=1}^m.$$

We note that, if we use FEGM, then M and S are the standard mass matrix and stiffness matrix, respectively. While, recalling the eigenvalue problem (3.1), if we use GGM we have $M = I_m$ and $S = \mathrm{diag}(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_m)$. Therefore, in both cases, M and S are nonsingular matrices.

Now we write the system of linear second order ODEs (3.8), as a system of linear first order ODEs

$$\dot{\mathrm{D}}(t) + \tilde{M}^{-1}\tilde{S}\mathrm{D}(t) - \tilde{M}^{-1}\tilde{\tilde{S}}\int_0^t K(t-s)\mathrm{D}(s)ds = \tilde{M}^{-1}\tilde{F}(t), \quad t \in (0,T), \tag{3.9}$$

where

$$\mathrm{D}(t) = \begin{bmatrix}\alpha(t)\\ \dot{\alpha}(t)\end{bmatrix}, \quad \tilde{F}(t) = \begin{bmatrix}0\\ F(t)\end{bmatrix}$$
$$\tilde{M} = \begin{bmatrix}M & 0\\ 0 & M\end{bmatrix}, \quad \tilde{S} = \begin{bmatrix}0 & -M\\ S & 0\end{bmatrix}, \quad \tilde{\tilde{S}} = \begin{bmatrix}0 & 0\\ S & 0\end{bmatrix}.$$

Then integrating with respect to t and interchanging the order of integrals for the convolution term, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{D}(t) &= \int_0^t \tilde{M}^{-1}\Big(\tilde{S} - \int_s^t K(r-s)dr\ \tilde{\tilde{S}}\Big)\mathrm{D}(s)\ ds + \int_0^t \tilde{M}^{-1}\tilde{F}(s)\ ds + \mathrm{D}(0) \\ &= \int_0^t \mathcal{K}(t,s)\mathrm{D}(s)\ ds + \mathcal{F}(t), \quad t \in (0,T), \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

with obvious notations $\mathcal{K}$ and $\mathcal{F}$.

2. Now we solve the above integral equation by Picard iteration, see e.g., [16, §2.1] or [17, §8.2], that is defined by, for $t \in [0,T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{D}^0(t) &= \mathcal{F}(t), \\ \mathrm{D}^{n+1}(t) &= \int_0^t \mathcal{K}(t,s)\mathrm{D}^n(s)\ ds + \mathcal{F}(t), \quad n = 0, 1, \ldots. \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

We need to show that the Picard iterates $\{\mathrm{D}^n(t)\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ converges uniformly on $[0,T]$. We note that

$$\mathrm{D}^n(t) = \mathrm{D}^0(t) + \sum_{n=0}^{n-1} \big(\mathrm{D}^{n+1}(t) - \mathrm{D}^n(t)\big),$$

that is the partial sum of the infinite series

$$\mathrm{D}^0(t) + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \big(\mathrm{D}^{n+1}(t) - \mathrm{D}^n(t)\big). \tag{3.12}$$

Therefore, we first prove that the inifinite series is convergent uniformly on $[0,T]$, that implies uniform convergence of the Picard iterates $\{\mathrm{D}^n(t)\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$.

Denoting the standard maximum vector and matrix norms, for $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times m}$, by

$$|b|_\infty = \max_{1\le k\le m} |b_k|, \quad |B|_\infty = \max_{1\le k\le m} \sum_{j=1}^{m} |B_{k,j}|,$$

we have, recalling $\mathcal{K}$ and $\mathcal{F}$ from (3.10),

$$\sup_{0\le s\le t\le T} |\mathcal{K}(t,s)|_\infty \le |M^{-1}S|_\infty\big(1 + \|K\|_{L_1(0,T)}\big) =: \mathrm{Z}, \tag{3.13}$$

and, using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the trace inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{0\le t\le T}|\mathrm{D}^0(t)|_\infty = \sup_{0\le t\le T}|\mathcal{F}(t)|_\infty &\le |\mathrm{D}(0)|_\infty + \int_0^t |\tilde{F}(s)|_\infty\, ds \\
&\le \max\big(|\alpha(0)|_\infty + |\dot\alpha(0)|_\infty\big) \\
&\quad + \max_{1\le k\le m}\Big(\int_0^t |(f(s),\varphi_k)| + |(g(s),\varphi_k)_{\partial\Omega_{\mathrm{N}}}|\, ds\Big) \\
&\le \max\big(|\alpha(0)|_\infty + |\dot\alpha(0)|_\infty\big) \\
&\quad + \max_{1\le k\le m}\Big(\int_0^t \|f(s)\|\|\varphi_k\| + \|g(s)\|_{\partial\Omega_{\mathrm{N}}}\|\varphi_k\|_{\partial\Omega_{\mathrm{N}}}\, ds\Big) \\
&\le \max\big(|\alpha(0)|_\infty + |\dot\alpha(0)|_\infty\big) \\
&\quad + \Big(\|f\|_{L_1((0,T);H)} + \|g\|_{L_1((0,T);H_{\partial\Omega_{\mathrm{N}}})}\Big) \\
&\quad\quad \times \max_{1\le k\le m}\big(\|\varphi_k\| + C_{\mathrm{Trace}}\|\varphi_k\|_V\big) \\
&=: \mathrm{Z}^0.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

Therefore, we have

$$|\mathrm{D}^1(t) - \mathrm{D}^0(t)|_\infty \le \int_0^t |\mathcal{K}(t,s)|_\infty |\mathrm{D}^0(s)|_\infty\, ds \le \mathrm{Z}\mathrm{Z}^0 t,$$

We need to show that, for $n = 0, 1, \ldots,$

$$|\mathrm{D}^{n+1}(t) - \mathrm{D}^n(t)|_\infty \le \frac{\mathrm{Z}^{n+1}t^{n+1}}{(n+1)!}\mathrm{Z}^0. \tag{3.15}$$

The poof is by induction. Indeed, the case $n = 0$ has already been proved above. If we assume that (3.15) holds for $n-1$, then for n we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathrm{D}^{n+1}(t) - \mathrm{D}^n(t)|_\infty &\le \int_0^t |\mathcal{K}(t,s)|_\infty |\mathrm{D}^n(s) - \mathrm{D}^{n-1}(s)|_\infty\, ds \\
&\le \mathrm{Z}\int_0^t \frac{\mathrm{Z}^n s^n}{n!}\mathrm{Z}^0\, ds \\
&\le \frac{\mathrm{Z}^{n+1}t^{n+1}}{(n+1)!}\mathrm{Z}^0.
\end{aligned}$$

Obviously, from (3.15), we have

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]}|\mathrm{D}^{n+1}(t) - \mathrm{D}^n(t)|_\infty \le \frac{\mathrm{Z}^{n+1}T^{n+1}}{(n+1)!}\mathrm{Z}^0,$$

that concludes the infinite series (3.12) is uniformly convergent on $[0,T]$. Therefore the Picard iterates $\{\mathrm{D}^n(t)\}_{n=0}^\infty$ converges uniformly on $[0,T]$, say to $\mathrm{D}(t)$, i.e.,

$$\mathrm{D}(t) = \lim_{n\to\infty}\mathrm{D}^n(t), \quad t\in[0,T].$$

3. Finally, it remains to prove uniqueness. Assume that $\tilde{\mathrm{D}}$ be another solution of the integral equation (3.10). Then

$$\mathrm{D}(t) - \tilde{\mathrm{D}}(t) = \int_0^t \mathcal{K}(t,s)\big(\mathrm{D}(s) - \tilde{\mathrm{D}}(s)\big)ds,$$

and consequently, we have

$$|\mathrm{D}(t)-\tilde{\mathrm{D}}(t)|_\infty \le \int_0^t |\mathcal{K}(t,s)|_\infty |\mathrm{D}(s)-\tilde{\mathrm{D}}(s)|_\infty ds \le \mathrm{Z}\int_0^t |\mathrm{D}(s)-\tilde{\mathrm{D}}(s)|_\infty ds,$$

that, by Gronwall's inequality, implies that $|\mathrm{D}(t)-\tilde{\mathrm{D}}(t)|_\infty = 0$, and therefore $\mathrm{D}=\tilde{\mathrm{D}}$. Hence the uniqueness is proved. Now the proof is complete. □

We note that Lemma 1 holds true for any Galerkin method for which matrices M and S in (3.8) are well-defined and M is invertible.

Remark 1. We recall $\mathcal{K}$ and $\mathcal{F}$ from (3.10) and the assumptions that the kernel K and the load and surface terms f and g are integrable. Therefore $\mathcal{K}$ and $\mathcal{F}$ are continuous functions, and steps 2 and 3 of the proof of Lemma 1 is concluded from [16, Theorem 2.1.1]. We also note that, using (3.11) one can show by induction, that each $\mathrm{D}^n \in \mathcal{C}[0,T]$. Hence, taking the limit $n\to\infty$ of both sides of the Picard iteration (3.11) and thanks to uniform convergence, we conclude that $\mathrm{D}\in\mathcal{C}[0,T]$ is a solution of the integral equation (3.10). However, we have added more details to the proof to be complete and to show how the initial data and the load and surface terms should be estimated. For example, let consider the global Galerkin method based on the eigenfuncations of the operator A, and recall that $M=I_m$, $S=\mathrm{diag}(\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_m)$. Then recalling (3.6) we have, from (3.13),

$$\mathrm{Z}=(1+\kappa)\max_{1\le k\le m}|\lambda_k|,$$

and, from (3.14),

$$\mathrm{Z}^0=\|u^0\|+\|u^1\|+\|f\|_{L_1((0,T);H)}+C_{\mathrm{Trace}}\|g\|_{L_1((0,T);H_{\partial\Omega_{\mathrm{N}}})}\max_{1\le k\le m}\|\varphi_k\|_V,$$

and we note that for this case we need to assume $u^0\in H$ and $u^1\in H$.

Further analysis on regularity estimates of the solution can be found in [1].

4. The spatial finite elment discretization

In this section, for simplicity, we consider pure homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition. We recall the variational form (2.1).

Let Ω be a convex polygonal domain and $\{\mathcal{T}_h\}$ be a regular family of triangulations of Ω with corresponding family of finite element spaces $V_h^l\subset V$, consisting of continuous piecewise polynomials of degree at most $l-1$, that vanish on $\partial\Omega$ (so the mesh is required to fit $\partial\Omega$). Here $l\ge 2$ is an integer number. We define piecewise constant mesh function $h_{\mathsf{K}}(x)=\mathrm{diam}(\mathsf{K})$ for $x\in\mathsf{K}$, $\mathsf{K}\in\mathcal{T}_h$, and for our error analysis we denote $h=\max_{\mathsf{K}\in\mathcal{T}_h}h_{\mathsf{K}}$. We note that the finite element spaces V_h^l have the property that

$$\min_{\chi\in V_h^l}\{\|v-\chi\|+h\|v-\chi\|_1\}\le Ch^i\|v\|_i,\quad \text{for } v\in H^i\cap V,\ 1\le i\le l. \tag{4.1}$$

We recall the L_2-projection P_h and the Ritz projection R_h from (3.2). We also recall the elliptic regularity estimate

$$\|u\|_2\le C\|Au\|,\quad u\in\mathcal{D}(A)=H^2\cap V,$$

such that the error estimates (4.1) hold true for the Ritz projection R_h, see [18], i.e.,

$$\|(R_h-I)v\|+h\|(R_h-I)v\|_1\le Ch^i\|v\|_i,\quad \text{for } v\in H^i\cap V,\ 1\le i\le l. \tag{4.2}$$

Then, the spatial finite element discretization of (2.1) is to find $u_h(t) \in V_h^l$ such that $u_h(0) = u_h^0,\ \dot{u}_h(0) = u_h^1$, and for $t \in (0,T)$,

$$(\ddot{u}_h, v_h) + a(u_h, v_h) - \int_0^t K(t-s)a(u_h(s), v_h)\, ds = (f, v_h), \quad \forall v_h \in V_h^l, \tag{4.3}$$

where u_h^0 and u_h^1 are suitable approximations to be chosen, respectively, for u_0 and u^1 in V_h^l.

For our analysis, we define a function ξ by

$$\xi(t) = \kappa - \int_0^t K(s)\, ds = \int_t^T K(s)\, ds, \quad t \in [0,T], \tag{4.4}$$

and, having (1.2), it is easy to see that

$$D_t\xi(t) = -K(t) < 0, \quad \xi(0) = \kappa, \quad \xi(T) = 0, \quad 0 \le \xi(t) \le \kappa. \tag{4.5}$$

Hence, ξ is a completely monotone function, since

$$(-1)^j D_t^j \xi(t) \ge 0, \quad t \in (0,T),\ j = 0,1,2,$$

and consequently $\xi \in L_{1,loc}[0,\infty)$ is a positive type kernel, that is, for any $T \ge 0$ and $\phi \in \mathcal{C}([0,T])$,

$$\int_0^T \int_0^t \xi(t-s)\phi(t)\phi(s)\, ds\, dt \ge 0. \tag{4.6}$$

Theorem 1. *Assume that Ω is a convex polygonal domain. Let u and u_h be, respectively, the solutions of* (2.1) *and* (4.3). *Then*

(*i*) *with initial condition $u_h^1 = P_h u^1$, we have*

$$\|u_h(T) - u(T)\| \le C\|u_h^0 - R_h u^0\| + Ch^l\Big(\|u(T)\|_l + \int_0^T \|\dot{u}\|_l\, d\tau\Big), \tag{4.7}$$

(*ii*) *and with initial condition $u_h^0 = R_h u^0$, we have*

$$\|\dot{u}_h(T) - \dot{u}(T)\| \le C\|u_h^1 - R_h u^1\| + Ch^l\Big(\|\dot{u}(T)\|_l + \int_0^T \|\ddot{u}\|_l\, d\tau\Big). \tag{4.8}$$

$$\|u_h(T) - u(T)\|_V \le C\|u_h^1 - R_h u^1\|_V + Ch^{l-1}\Big(\|u(T)\|_l + \int_0^T \|\ddot{u}\|_{l-1}\, d\tau\Big). \tag{4.9}$$

Proof. The proof is adapted from [13]. We split the error as

$$e = u_h - u = (u_h - R_h u) + (R_h u - u) = \theta + \omega. \tag{4.10}$$

We need to estimate θ, since the spatial projection error ω is estimated from (4.2).

So, putting θ in (4.3) we have, for $v_h \in V_h^l$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\ddot{\theta}, v_h) + a(\theta, v_h) - \int_0^t K(t-s)a(\theta(s), v_h)ds \\
&\quad = (\ddot{u}_h, v_h) + a(u_h, v_h) - \int_0^t K(t-s)a(u_h(s), v_h)ds \\
&\qquad - (R_h\ddot{u}, v_h) - a(R_h u, v_h) + \int_0^t K(t-s)a(R_h u(s), v_h)ds,
\end{aligned}$$

that using (4.3), the definition of the Ritz projection R_h, and (2.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}(\ddot{\theta}, v_h) + a(\theta, v_h) - \int_0^t K(t-s)a(\theta(s), v_h)ds \\ = (f, v_h) - (R_h\ddot{u}, v_h) - a(u, v_h) + \int_0^t K(t-s)a(u(s), v_h)ds \\ = (\ddot{u}, v_h) - (R_h\ddot{u}, v_h) = -(\ddot{\omega}, v_h).\end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

Therefore we can write, for $v_h(t) \in V_h^l$, $t \in (0, T]$,

$$\frac{d}{dt}(\dot{\theta}, v_h) - (\dot{\theta}, \dot{v}_h) + a(\theta, v_h) - \int_0^t K(t-s)a(\theta(s), v_h(t))ds = -\frac{d}{dt}(\dot{\omega}, v_h) + (\dot{\omega}, \dot{v}_h),$$

that, recalling $e = \theta + \omega$, we obtain

$$-(\dot{\theta}, \dot{v}_h) + a(\theta, v_h) - \int_0^t K(t-s)a(\theta(s), v_h(t))ds = -\frac{d}{dt}(\dot{e}, v_h) + (\dot{\omega}, \dot{v}_h) \tag{4.12}$$

Now let $0 < \varepsilon \leq T$, and we make the particular choice

$$v_h(\cdot, t) = \int_t^\varepsilon \theta(\cdot, \tau)d\tau, \qquad 0 \leq t \leq T,$$

then clearly we have

$$v_h(\cdot, \varepsilon) = 0, \quad \frac{d}{dt}v_h(\cdot, t) = -\theta(\cdot, t), \quad 0 \leq t \leq T. \tag{4.13}$$

Hence, considering (4.13) in (4.12) , we have

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}(\|\theta\|^2 - \|v_h\|_V^2) - \int_0^t K(t-s)a(\theta(s), v_h(t))ds = -\frac{d}{dt}(\dot{e}, v_h) - (\dot{\omega}, \theta).$$

Now, integrating from $t = 0$ to $t = \varepsilon$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\theta(\varepsilon)\|^2 - \|\theta(0)\|^2 - \|v_h(\varepsilon)\|_V^2 + \|v_h(0)\|_V^2 - 2\int_0^\varepsilon \int_0^t K(t-s)a(\theta(s), v_h(t))dsdt \\ = -2(\dot{e}(\varepsilon), v_h(\varepsilon)) + 2(\dot{e}(0), v_h(0)) - 2\int_0^\varepsilon (\dot{\omega}, \theta)dt.\end{aligned}$$

Then, using the initial assuption $u_h^1 = \mathcal{P}_h u^1$ that implies the second term on the right side is zero and recalling $v_h(\varepsilon) = 0$, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}\|\theta(\varepsilon)\|^2 + \|v_h(0)\|_V^2 - 2\int_0^\varepsilon \int_0^t K(t-s)a(\theta(s), v_h(t))dsdt \\ = \|\theta(0)\|^2 - 2\int_0^\varepsilon (\dot{\omega}, \theta)dt,\end{aligned}$$

that, using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, implies

$$\begin{aligned}\|\theta(\varepsilon)\|^2 + \|v_h(0)\|_V^2 - 2\int_0^\varepsilon \int_0^t K(t-s)a(\theta(s), v_h(t))dsdt \\ \leq \|\theta(0)\|^2 + 2\max_{0\leq t\leq\varepsilon}\|\theta(t)\| \int_0^\varepsilon \|\dot{\omega}\|dt.\end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

Now, by changing the order of integrals, using $\frac{d}{dt}\xi(t-s) = -K(t-s)$ from (4.5), and integration by parts, we can write the third term on the left side as

$$\begin{aligned}-2\int_0^\varepsilon\int_0^t K(t-s)a(\theta(s),v_h(t))dsdt &= 2\int_0^\varepsilon\int_s^\varepsilon \frac{d}{dt}\xi(t-s)a(\theta(s),v_h(t))dtds\\ &= 2\int_0^\varepsilon \xi(\varepsilon-s)a(\theta(s),v_h(\varepsilon))ds - 2\int_0^\varepsilon \xi(0)a(\theta(s),v_h(s))ds\\ &\quad - 2\int_0^\varepsilon\int_s^\varepsilon \xi(t-s)a(\theta(s),\dot v_h(t))dtds.\end{aligned}$$

Then, using (4.13) and $\xi(0)=\kappa$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}-2\int_0^\varepsilon\int_0^t K(t-s)a(\theta(s),v_h(t))dsdt&\\ = \kappa(\|v_h(\varepsilon)\|_V^2 - \|v_h(0)\|_V^2) + 2\int_0^\varepsilon\int_s^\varepsilon \xi(t-s)a(\theta(s),\theta(t))dtds.&\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, using this and $v_h(\varepsilon)=0$ in (4.14) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\theta(\varepsilon)\|^2 + (1-\kappa)\|v_h(0)\|_V^2 + 2\int_0^\varepsilon\int_s^\varepsilon \xi(t-s)a(\theta(s),\theta(t))dtds&\\ \le \|\theta(0)\|^2 + 2\max_{0\le t\le\varepsilon}\|\theta(t)\|\int_0^\varepsilon \|\dot\omega\|dt,&\end{aligned}$$

that considering the fact that ξ is a positive type kernel and $\kappa<1$, in a standard way, implies that

$$\|\theta(T)\| \le C(\|\theta(0)\| + \int_0^T \|\dot\omega\|d\tau).$$

Hence, recaling (4.10), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|e(T)\| &\le \|\theta(T)\| + \|\omega(T)\|\\ &\le C\Big(\|u_h^0 - R_h u^0\| + \int_0^T \|R_h\dot u - \dot u\|dt\Big) + \|(R_h u - u)(T)\|,\end{aligned}$$

that using the error estimate (4.2) implies the a priori error estimate (4.7).

Now, to prove the second and the third error estimates (4.8)-(4.9), we choose $v_h = \dot\theta(t)$ in (4.11). Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\dot\theta(t)\|^2 + \|\theta(t)\|_V^2 - 2\int_0^t\int_0^\tau K(\tau-s)a(\theta(s),\dot\theta(\tau))\,dsd\tau&\\ = \|\dot\theta(0)\|^2 + \|\theta(0)\|_V^2 - 2\int_0^t(\ddot\omega,\dot\theta)d\tau.&\end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

We can write the third term in the left side as, recalling $K(t-s)=\frac{d}{ds}\xi(t-s)$, $\xi(0)=\kappa$ from (4.5), and integration by parts

$$
\begin{aligned}
-2\int_0^t\int_0^\tau & K(\tau-s)a(\theta(s),\dot\theta(\tau))\;dsd\tau\\
&=-2\int_0^t\int_0^\tau \frac{d}{ds}\xi(\tau-s)a(\theta(s),\dot\theta(\tau))\;dsd\tau\\
&=-2\int_0^t \xi(0)a(\theta(\tau),\dot\theta(\tau))\;d\tau+2\int_0^t \xi(\tau)a(\theta(0),\dot\theta(\tau))\;d\tau\\
&\quad+2\int_0^t\int_0^\tau \xi(\tau-s)a(\theta'(s),\dot\theta(\tau))\;dsd\tau\\
&=-\kappa\|\theta(t)\|_V^2+\kappa\|\theta(0)\|_V^2+2\int_0^t \xi(\tau)a(\theta(0),\dot\theta(\tau))\;d\tau\\
&\quad+2\int_0^t\int_0^\tau \xi(\tau-s)a(\theta'(s),\dot\theta(\tau))\;dsd\tau.
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.16}
$$

Then, putting (4.16) in (4.15) and using the initial value assumption $\theta(0)=u_h^0-R_hu^0=0$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|\dot\theta(t)\|^2+(1-\kappa)\|\theta(t)\|_V^2+2\int_0^t\int_0^\tau \xi(\tau-s)a(\theta'(s),\dot\theta(\tau))\;dsd\tau&\\
=\|\dot\theta(0)\|^2-2\int_0^t(\ddot\omega,\dot\theta)d\tau.&
\end{aligned}
$$

That, using the fact that ξ is a positive type kernel, in a standard way, we have

$$
\|\dot\theta(t)\|+(1-\kappa)\|\theta(t)\|_V^2\le C\big(\|\dot\theta(0)\|+\int_0^t\|\ddot\omega\|d\tau\big).
$$

Hence, recalling (4.10) and $t\in(0,T]$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|\dot e(T)\|&\le\|\dot\theta(T)\|+\|\dot\omega(T)\|\\
&\le C\Big(\|u_h^1-R_hu^1\|+\int_0^T\|(R_h\ddot u-\ddot u)(\tau)\;\|d\tau\Big)+\|(R_h\dot u-\dot u)(T)\|\\
\|e(T)\|_V&\le\|\theta(T)\|_V+\|\omega(T)\|_V\\
&\le C\Big(\|u_h^1-R_hu^1\|+\int_0^T\|(R_h\ddot u-\ddot u)(\tau)\|\;d\tau\Big)+\|(R_hu-u)(T)\|_V.
\end{aligned}
$$

These, using the error estimate (4.2), imply the a priori error estimates (4.8) and (4.9). The proof is now complete. □

We note that important tools in our error analysis is properly choosing initial data approximations and using the auxiliary function ξ, that is of positive type, and integration by parts, that simplifies the proof.

Illustration of the order of convergence by our numerical examples are similar to, e.g. [2], and therefore we have not presented numerical experiments, for short.

References

[1] F. Saedpanah, Well-posedness of an integro-differential equation with positive type kernels modeling fractional order viscoelasticity, European J Mech-A Solid 44, (2014) 201–211.

[2] S. Larsson and F. Saedpanah, The continuous Galerkin method for an integro-differential equation modeling dynamic fractional order viscoelasticity. IMA J Numer Anal 30, (2010), 964–986.
[3] B. Rivière, S. Shaw, and J. R. Whiteman, Discontinuous Galerkin finite element methods for dynamic linear solid viscoelasticity problems, Numer Methods Partial Differential Equations 23, (2007), 1149–1166.
[4] K. Adolfsson, M. Enelund, and S. Larsson, Space-time discretization of an integro-differential equation modeling quasi-static fractional-order viscoelasticity, J Vib Control 14, (2008), 1631–1649.
[5] W. McLean and V. Thomée, Numerical solution via Laplace transforms of a fractional order evolution equation, J Integral Equations Appl 22, (2010), 57–94.
[6] F. Saedpanah, A posteriori error analysis for a continuous space-time finite element method for a hyperbolic integro-differential equation, BIT Numer Math 53, (2013) 689–716.
[7] A. K. Pani and V. Thomée and L. B. Wahlbin, Numerical methods for hyperbolic and parabolic integro-differential equations, J Integral Equations Appl 4, (1992) 533–584.
[8] K. Adolfsson, M. Enelund, and S. Larsson, Adaptive discretization of fractional order viscoelasticity using sparse time history, Comput Methods Appl Mech Engrg 193, (2004), 4567–4590.
[9] Y. Lin, V. Thomée, and L. B. Wahlbin, Ritz-Volterra projections to finite-element spaces and application to integro-differential and related equations, SIAM J Numer Anal 28, (1991), 1047-1070.
[10] J. Rauch, On convergence of the finite element method for the wave equation, SIAM J Numer Anal 22, (1985) 245–249.
[11] K. Adolfsson, M. Enelund, S. Larsson, and M. Racheva, Discretization of integro-differential equations modeling dynamic fractional order viscoelasticity, LNCS 3743, (2006), 76–83.
[12] F. Saedpanah, Optimal order finite element approximation for a hyperbolic integro-differential equation, BIMS 38, (2012), 447–459.
[13] G. A. Baker, Error estimates for finite element methods for second order hyperbolic equations, SIAM J Numer Anal 13, (1976), 564–576.
[14] M. Kovács and S. Larsson and F. Saedpanah, Finite element approximation for the linear stochastic wave equation with additive noise, SIAM J Numer Anal 48, (2010) 408–427.
[15] S. Shaw and J. R. Whiteman, A posteriori error estimates for space-time finite element approximation of quasistatic hereditary linear viscoelasticity problems, Comput Methods Appl Mech Engrg 193, (2004), 5551–5572.
[16] T. A. Burton, Volterra Integral and Differential Equations, Mathematics in Science and Engineering 202, Elsevier, Berlin, 2005.
[17] W. G. Kelley and A. C. Peterson, The Theory of Differential Equations, Springer, New York, 2010.
[18] V. Thomée, Galerkin Finite Element Methods for Parabolic Problems, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006.

Department of Mathematics, University of Kurdistan, P. O. Box 416, Sanandaj, Iran
E-mail address: f.saedpanah@uok.ac.ir, f_saedpanah@yahoo.com